

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 are pending in this application. Claims 5 and 12 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13 and 15 have been currently amended. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 20 are independent claims. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings.

Drawings

The drawings filed on 07/27/2001 were objected to by the Draftsperson because the margins of FIGS. 1 and 2A are not acceptable. The Replacement drawings have been attached to this Response to replace the original FIGS. 1 and 2A.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-7 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holden (“Holden”; U.S. Patent No. 5,570,348). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, independent Claims 1 and 15 have been currently amended.

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, “anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites “a fabric connection, including a fabric switch, for communicatively connecting the external device to the controller via the fabric switch” (emphasis added). Independent Claim 15, as amended, recites “a fabric connection, including a fabric switch, for operably connecting the first external device, the second external device and the controller via the fabric switch” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the above-indicated elements claimed in Claims 1 and 15 are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by Holden because in Holden the routing table

circuit 30 (analogized to the “controller” by the Patent Office) is *directly, not* via a fabric switch, connected to elements 50 and 52 (analogized to the “external electronic device” by the Patent Office) (see, e.g., FIG. 3 of Holden). Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn, and Claims 1 and 15 should be allowed.

Claims 2-4 and 6-7 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable due to their dependence upon Claim 1. Claims 16-19 depend from Claim 15 and are therefore allowable due to their dependence upon Claim 15.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 8-14 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holden in view of Aruga (“Aruga”, U.S. Patent No. 6,542,954). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (emphasis added) (MPEP § 2143). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. (emphasis added) *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Independent Claim 8, as amended, recites “a fabric connection, including a fabric switch, for operably connecting the external device to the storage array controller via the fabric switch” (emphasis added). For similar reasons as indicated in the foregoing *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102* section, Holden fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the above-indicated element as claimed in Claim 8. Thus, independent Claim 8 are nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 9-11 and 13-14 depend from Claim 8 and are therefore nonobvious due to their dependence. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn, and Claims 8-11 and 13-14 should be allowed.

Independent Claim 20 recites "a bypass line directly connected with an internal interconnect of the controller through a switch" (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office has failed to indicate that exactly where was the above-indicated element recited in Claim 20 taught, disclosed, or suggested. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn, and Claim 20 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the case.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
LSI Logic Corporation,

Dated: April 13, 2004

By: _____

Peng Zhu
Reg. No. 48,063

SUITER • WEST PC LLO
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, NE 68154
(402) 496-0300 telephone
(402) 496-0333 facsimile